



Deval L. Patrick  
Governor

# *The Commonwealth of Massachusetts*

## *Department of Public Safety*

*One Ashburton Place, Room 1301*

*Boston, Massachusetts 02108-1618*

*Phone (617) 727-3200*

*Fax (617) 727-5732*

*TTY (617) 727-0019*

[www.mass.gov/dps](http://www.mass.gov/dps)

Andrea J. Cabral  
Secretary

Thomas G. Gatzunis, P.E.  
Commissioner

### **Minutes**

#### **Board of Building Regulations and Standards**

#### **Fire Prevention Fire Protection (FPFP) Advisory Committee**

**RJA, Inc. - 1661 Worcester Road – Suite 501, Framingham, MA - Conference Room**

**November 10, 2014, 9:00 a.m.**

1. Roll Call - Call to Order 9:10 am

1.1. Robert Carasitti Chair (RC)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	
1.2. Dave LeBlanc V-Chair (DL)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	
1.3. Walter Adams (WA)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	Departed 11:36 am
1.4. Don Contois (DC)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	
1.5. Harold Cutler (HC)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	
1.6. Rob Anderson (RA or designee)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	Mike Guigli for RA (MG)
1.7. Chief Gary McCarraher (GM)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	
1.8. Boston Fire Commissioner	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	Paul Donga for BFD (PD) 9:15 am
1.9. State Fire Marshal (or designee)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	Jen Hoyt for the SFM
1.10. Kurt Ruchala (KR)	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	9:33 am
1.11. Louise Vera (LV) or Alternate	✓ present	<input type="checkbox"/> absent	Jeff Putnam (JP) for LV

The chair noted that with 11 members present a quorum was achieved. (Additional members arrived shortly thereafter)

General note on format: votes are noted as (Motion by: XX, Second by: XX, Vote: In Favor-Opposed- Abstaining).

2. Review and approval of minutes from October 30 meeting

JH commented on typographical errors:

- Item 2, paragraph 1 – Correct spelling of “completed”
- Item 2, paragraph 2 – Correct spelling of “separate”

JH also noted that under Item 2, Chapter 31 was the same as the 8<sup>th</sup> Edition... this should be substituted for the placeholder “?”.

A motion was made to have the chair completes edits to reflect the above comments and approve as noted.

Motion: GM so moved      2nd: JH      Vote: 8-0-1      DC abstained, PD and KR not present

3. Additional Commenting via track change or red line editing of White Paper on fire protection.

Agenda Item 3 was tabled so Item 4 could be taken out of order. After discussion of Item 4, the committee returned to Item 3. See Item 5.

4. Overview of draft MA Amendments to International Building Code 2015 for adoption as the 9<sup>th</sup> Edition of 780 CMR and delegation of sections for review by FPPF members.

The chair reviewed past meeting work and the discussion picked up with the definitions. Counsel for DPS Deirdre Hosler reviewed legal opinion on the night club definition and recommended the definition be change to capture the aspects/conditions to what makes a nightclub a nightclub. An example was presented by the chair where the night club definition was, in his opinion, inappropriately applied. Other examples were provided as well. In the end consensus was not achieved on a new definition for nightclub and the matter was tabled.

The committee next discussed the definition of fire area and the consequences of reverting to the virgin IBC definition. It was noted that such an approach would be a policy change from the past 3 editions of 780 CMR as well as the understanding supported by BBRS during the Model 15 effort. In the end, the chair called for a straw poll on 3 approaches:

1. Keep the aggregate area definition and concept from the 8<sup>th</sup> Edition
2. Use the IBC definition for fire area but edit Section 903.2 and its subsections to reflect aggregate areas
3. Use the IBC definition for fire area and the IBC fire area concept in Section 903.2.

The straw poll indicated 3 in favor of approach 1, 5 in favor of approach 2 and 2 in favor of approach 3 (MG abstained). The matter was tabled so members could consider the matter further.

The committee next reviewed Chapter 9 items:

903.3.1.3 – a comment about the 14,400 sf single family requirement was noted ... it needs to be picked up in the Residential Code.

904.13 – a comment was noted that water mists could be deleted but that aerosol systems now need to be included.

905.3.8 – a recommendation to delete was noted. Opposition to deletion was noted. The committee needs to revisit.

At this point the 9<sup>th</sup> Edition review was tabled due to time considerations. The committee moved back to Item 3.

5. Objections were noted to the revised white paper that identified FPPF as an author and as making recommendations.

The chair reviewed past discussions and recommended that the committee reaffirm its previous comments to the Board and not use track changes as it was clear at this point that the committee was not supportive of the paper or in agreement with its premise or stated positions.

DL provided comments:

- The laws of supply and demand is not discussed and this aspect drives the costs of homes far more than construction costs. KR interjected that “wants” and not “needs” drives up the costs.
- The sprinkler costs can be significantly reduced if the water supply hookup fees could be better addressed.

DC provided similar comments to the above but also included a recommendation that maybe the BBRS should be looking at better defining the substantial alteration threshold at which they expect fire protection upgrades as was done in previous editions of 780 CMR.

JH provided comments:

- The paper should be neutral and it is not. The one sided argument undertone is common throughout.

- The FPFP discussion is compelled to act as counterpoint when the paper should already include counterpoints.
- Per unit cost data is inappropriate given the varying in size of a unit directly correlate to the price. A price per sf data needs to be used.
- There needs to be clarification of the technical aspects of fire alarm systems required for 3-6 unit buildings.

The discussion ended due to time. Members were instructed to complete reviews for discussion at next meeting in November ahead of the BBRs December meeting.

6. Matters not reasonably anticipated within two business days of the meeting.

There were no new matters presented.

7. Approval to adjourn the meeting

The next meeting was set for November 25 at 9 am. A notice will be posted by BBRs staff. A motion was made to adjourn.

Motion: DL so moved      2nd: GM      Vote: 10-0-0      Walter Adams had departed and was not present.